

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/773,274	02/09/2004	Yong Liang Chu	3781-009-27	8563
7590 01/28/2005		EXAMINER		
Supervisor, Patent Prosecution Services			MOSHER, MARY	
PIPER RUDNICK LLP 1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036-2412			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	, <u></u>					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/773,274	CHU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D.	1648				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/12/	04. 10/13/04.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	_					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-46 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	_					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The substitute specification filed 10/13/2004 has not been entered (at least not for examination purposes) because it does not conform to 37 CFR 1.125(b) and (c) because: it does not show the changes from the previously filed version, and it is not accompanied by a statement regarding new matter. Therefore examination should be based upon the as-filed specification, the preliminary amendment filed July 12, 2004, and the Sequence Listing filed October 13, 2004.

In addition, applicant may wish to review the claims for errors; for example, claim 28 requires a peptide that is outside the scope of parent claim 27.

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-14, drawn to assay method, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1 for example.
- II. Claims 15-26, 33-46, drawn to chemical conjugation processes and products, classified in class 530, subclass 402 for example. If this group is elected, election of species is further required.
- III. Claims 27-32, drawn to glycopeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 324-330 for example. If this group is chosen, election of species is further required.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the

process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the peptides, as claimed, can be used in a materially different process such as sitmulating an immune response.

Inventions II and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the products, as claimed, can be made by a materially different process such as digestion of a glycoprotein, and the process as claimed can be used to make poypeptides unrelated to the SARS peptides of group II.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and because each group requires a different search, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

## Election of Species

**Group II** contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- conjugation comprising a dicarboxylic acid linker between amino and carboxyl groups
  - 2. conjugation comprising a linker between carboxyl and thiol groups.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic, but claims 43-46 are drawn to a Markush group encompassing both species. The species are distinct because they use different starting materials and different active steps to produce structurally and functionally distinct products.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

**Group III** contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: SEQ ID No: 1-22.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic, but claims 27-32 are drawn to a Markush group of species. The species are distinct, because each one differs in structure and in immunogenic properties from all of the others, such that a reference teaching one peptide would not necessarily render obvious any other of the peptides.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and alternate F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,274

Art Unit: 1648

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1/27/05

MARY E. MOSHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800 / 6 00

Page 7